**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM**

**PRESENT :**

**THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANTONY DOMINIC**

**TUESDAY, THE 20TH NOVEMBER 2007 / 29TH KARTHIKA 1929**

**RP.No. 1117 of 2007(H)**
**----------**
**AGAINST THE JUDGEMENT/ORDER IN WPC.28429/2007**
**.....**

**REVIEW PETITIONER/3RD RESPONDENT**
**----------**

**R.MADHUSOODANAN, S/O.RAMANKUTTY,**
**MATTUKAD HOUSE, COYALMANNAM, PALAKKAD.**

**BY ADV. SRI.G.PRABHAKARAN**

**RESPONDENTS:RESPONDENTS/PETITIONER**
**----------**

**1. THE REGIONAL TRANSPORT AUTHORITY,**
**PALAKKAD, REPRESENTED BY ITS SECRETARY.**

**2. THE SECRETARY, THE REGIONAL TRANSPORT**
**AUTHORITY, PALAKKAD.**

**3. M.A.ABDUL KHADER, ISMAIL MANZIL,**
**PITTU PEEDIKA, KODUVAYOOR.**

**BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.I.V.PRAMOD**

**THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 19/11/2007, THE COURT ON 20/11/2007 PASSED THE FOLLOWING:**

**ANTONY DOMINIC, J.**
**==========**
**R.P No.1117 of 2007**
**IN**
**W.P.(C) NO. 28429 OF 2007 H**
**==========**

**Dated this the 20th day of November, 2007**

**O R D E R**

This review petition has been filed by the 3rd respondent in the writ petition. By judgment dated 3rd October, 2007, this court directed the 1st respondent to consider Ext.P3, a representation filed by the petitioner in the writ petition objecting to the grant of Ext.P1 permit. Review petitioner complains that the order affects him and that the same ought not have been passed without notice to him. I find that the petitioner is justified in his submission. Since, as a permit holder, his rights are likely to be affected, I feel, that before the writ petition was disposed of, the review petitioner ought to have been heard.

2. Accordingly, the judgment will stand recalled and the case will be heard afresh.

Review petition is disposed of.

**ANTONY DOMINIC, JUDGE.**

Rp